

## **Subcommittee on Interim Strong Mayor-- Recommendations**

Proposed Charter Language on Redevelopment, Prepared for Submission to the Full Committee by James Ingram

Per Subcommittee request, staff has prepared this report for forwarding to the San Diego Charter Review Committee.

At the Subcommittee's request, the staff worked with representatives from the City Attorney's Office to propose draft language for the City Charter. These representatives have helped to ensure that the form of the language is acceptable, although they are not authorized to endorse its content.

The Subcommittee made one recommendation for proposed Charter language, covering the issue of Redevelopment. The Subcommittee vote on the decision to forward this recommendation was 2-2, with one member absent (August 20, 2007).

### **REDEVELOPMENT**

#### ***Current Language***

The Charter does not contain any language regarding the issue of how the City is to handle redevelopment. The City Council acts as the Redevelopment Agency for the City, pursuant to provisions of California's Health and Safety Code. State law provides that cities may either make their governing bodies their redevelopment agency, or establish a separate redevelopment agency, whose members may be appointed by the Mayor with Council confirmation. Prior to the passage of Prop F, when San Diego employed the Council-Manager form of government, the City acted by ordinance to make the Council its Redevelopment Agency. With the passage of Prop F, the Mayor was removed from redevelopment, and thus the one policymaker who represents the whole City rather than a single district would hold no authority over redevelopment issues. Secondly, the Mayor as the CEO heads the executive branch, yet some of the executive branch's employees work under the Redevelopment Agency, clouding accountability in the City. To fix this problem, the Council has acted in its capacity as Redevelopment Agency to designate the Mayor as its Executive Director. This proposed Charter amendment would institutionalize the Council's action regarding redevelopment, and thus also clarify the ambiguous reporting relationships that emerged in terms of post-Prop F redevelopment.

#### ***Proposed Ballot Language Recommended by Subcommittee***

##### **Section 265: The Mayor**

###

(b) In addition to exercising the authority, power, and responsibilities formally conferred upon the City Manager as described in section 260(b), the Mayor shall have following additional rights, powers, and duties:

###

(18) The Mayor shall serve or be designated as the chief executive officer of any organization established by federal or state law for which the City Council acts as its governing or legislative body as of the effective date of the adoption of this section by the voters of the City of San Diego. In that capacity, the Mayor shall supervise

the administrative affairs of such organization, and shall have the same administrative and procedural power and authority over the affairs of such organization and governing or legislative body as the Mayor has in the conduct of the affairs of the City of San Diego, including the power of veto.

### ***Staff Addendum***

As it is presently drafted, this language would also make the Mayor the CEO of the Housing Authority. This is another City entity over which the Mayor lost all authority due to the implementation of Prop F. The City Council also acts as the Housing Authority, in accordance with California's aforementioned Health and Safety Code. It is important to distinguish between the Housing Authority and the Housing Commission. The City's Housing Commission may: "Investigate and improve dwelling conditions in the City of San Diego. Review and recommend revisions, actions, including recommendations on all matters before the Housing Authority. Approve plans, specifications, agreements, expenditures and such other matters as the Housing Authority may from time to time delegate by resolution to the commission" (Quoted from Commission website: <http://www.sandiego.gov/city-clerk/boards-commissions/861006.shtml>).

The Subcommittee was divided upon this issue. The members who made and seconded the motion voted in favor of forwarding it on to the full Committee. Two of the members voted against the motion. The fifth member of the Subcommittee was absent, and therefore the Subcommittee forwarded the recommendation without a consensus either way.